

Application Serial No. 10/626,900
Reply to office action of November 16, 2005

PATENT
Docket: CU-3308

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings. The Examiner claimed that the drawings do not show the limitation of claim 1 that recites "driving the RGB dot columns in the same set in two dot column in inversion."

Regarding the drawing objection, the Examiner's attention is directed to page 6 of the specification. Beginning at line 8, the specification states that the liquid crystal panel has a "plurality of sets" and that each set is made up of four R, G, B dot columns. On line 15, the specification states that the "R, G, B dot columns in a set are driven in two dot columns in inversion." Thus, the specification states that of a four-column set of R, G, B dot columns, two of the four columns have opposite polarity, which is precisely what is shown in FIG. 3 and FIG. 4.

The figures as filed *do* support claim 1 as filed *does* support the figures. The Examiner's objection to the drawings should be withdrawn.

As for the claim rejections, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 3 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) because of the Kim reference (2001-0015716). Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on the combination of Kim and Furuhashi (U.S. patent 6,127,995). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on the combination of Kim and Moriyama (U.S. patent 5,790,092).

Claim 1 as amended avoids the Kim reference.

For purposes of making this record clear, the applicant believes that the subject *claimed* in Kim is distinctly different than anything that is described in the pending application. The applicant also believes that the subject matter claimed in Kim is distinctly different than anything that the applicant makes, has made, uses or sells in the

Application Serial No. 10/626,900
Reply to office action of November 16, 2005

PATENT
Docket: CU-3308

United States.

As for the rejection of claims 1 and 3, claim 1 as amended is believed to avoid Kim. Paraphrased, claim 1 recites that dots are logically grouped into sets. The dots of a set are driven as a group. A groups of dots in one set is driven with a voltage, the polarity of which his opposite to the polarity used to drive dots in an adjacent set of dots.

In FIG. 3 and FIG. 4, the polarity of the voltage applied to the dots of a horizontal row changes every two dots. Stated alternatively in FIG. 3, two "+" dots lie side-by-side. Next to them lie two "-" dots. In FIG. 4, the polarity of the dots in adjacent rows changes every two rows of dots.


On page 6, beginning at line 5, the applicant points out that by using the claimed two-dot inversion method, green tinting that accompanied prior art methods is abated or prevented. As stated on page 8, beginning at line 4, the charging differential between adjacent pixels is reduced and common voltage signal distortion is reduced. Claim 1 therefore avoids Kim and is in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-4 have been superficially amended to maintain antecedent bases of the terms used in those claims. Since claims 2-4 narrow independent claim 1, each of them is allowable as well.

For the reasons set forth above, reconsideration of the claims is requested.

Dated: February 16, 2006

Respectfully submitted,


Joseph P. Krause, Reg. No. 32,578
Ladas & Parry LLP
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300